

The Efficiency of Defect Production in Planar Superconductors and Liquid Crystals

R. J. Rivers* and A. Swarup†
Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ
 (Dated: February 2, 2008)

A recent experiment that sees the spontaneous creation of magnetic flux on quenching high- T_c films has shown that earlier null results were a consequence of the lack of saturation of the Zurek-Kibble causal bounds against which flux density was measured. In this letter we estimate how efficient the production of topological charge is in planar systems, both for the aforementioned experiment (when flux measures topological charge) and for an earlier experiment on planar liquid crystals. Agreement is good.

PACS Numbers : 11.27.+d, 05.70.Fh, 11.10.Wx, 67.40.Vs

There have now been several experimental tests of the Zurek-Kibble (ZK) causal bounds for the production of defects (e.g. vortices) at continuous phase transitions. The ZK prediction is that the separation of defects ξ_{def} , at the time of their formation, satisfies a scaling law [1, 2, 3]

$$\xi_{def} = \frac{\xi_Z}{f} \equiv \frac{\xi_0}{f} \left(\frac{t_Q}{t_0} \right)^\sigma, \quad (1)$$

where t_Q^{-1} is the rate at which the temperature is quenched through its critical value T_c , t_0 is the relaxation time of the long wavelength modes, and ξ_0 is the correlation length at zero temperature. ξ_{def} is measured in units of ξ_Z , the Zurek causal length, defined through (1). ξ_Z is the minimum size of correlated domains after the implementation of the transition [1, 2]. The efficiency coefficient $f < 1$ that determines the extent to which the causal bound is saturated will depend on the system, but is generally assumed to be $O(1)$. Typically, for mean-field condensed matter systems describable by Ginzburg-Landau (GL) theory, the exponent $\sigma = 1/4$. Experiments in annular Josephson junctions [4] and nonlinear optical systems [5] have confirmed this value, where it is appropriate, within errors.

In this letter we begin by examining recent experiments to detect Abrikosov-like vortices at a temperature quench in planar high- T_c superconductors by measuring the magnetic flux that is spontaneously produced. The first of these experiments [6] was null, with no flux observed above the noise in the system. However, on increasing the quench rate by several orders of magnitude spontaneous flux was produced [7], but with low efficiency.

The experiments of Refs. [6] and [7] measure *net* magnetic flux i.e. net topological charge Δn , where Δn is the number of vortices n_+ minus the number of antivortices n_- . As it stands, however, Eq.1 only enables us to determine the total number $n = n_+ + n_-$ of vortices *plus* antivortices. To make predictions for net flux requires an understanding of vortex-antivortex correla-

tions. In the absence of explicit knowledge about correlations, both Kibble [3, 8] and Zurek [2] addressed this problem for $U(1)$ theories, with complex order parameter field $\phi = \rho e^{i\alpha}$, by assuming that the phase angle α makes a random walk around the perimeter of the region through which the flux is measured, with step length $O(\xi_Z)$. This is complemented by the 'geodesic rule', that the shortest paths are assumed to be taken in field space so as to minimise gradient energies. With these assumptions, the variance ΔN in the net flux through a surface with perimeter C is predicted to be

$$\Delta N = \tilde{f} \sqrt{\frac{C}{\xi_Z}} = \tilde{f} \sqrt{\frac{C}{\xi_0}} \left(\frac{t_Q}{t_0} \right)^{-\sigma/2} \quad (2)$$

for σ of (1) with an overall efficiency factor $\tilde{f}$, that again depends on the system. The relationship (2) was originally proposed by Zurek [2] for superconductors and for spontaneous superflow in ^4He .

Our first goal is to show how (2) arises from simple dynamics, and to estimate the efficiency factor $\tilde{f}$ for superconductors. Our second goal, postponed until later, is to apply the same ideas to experiments [9, 10] that measure ξ_{def} and ΔN in liquid crystals.

Care is needed in making comparisons between the two types of system. In particular, for flux measurement in superconductors, ΔN of (2) can only be part of the story. We also expect to see flux due to the freezing in of the long wavelength modes of the electromagnetic field at the transition [11]. In contrast to (2), which implies strong vortex-antivortex correlation, this shows strong vortex-vortex correlation. However, for low T_c and strong type-II behaviour the effects due directly to the magnetic field are negligible, as confirmed in numerical simulations [12, 13]. Although larger for high- T_c , its contribution to the variance in the net flux is still expected to be relatively small [14] in the experiments of [6, 7], and will be ignored. Further, since their contribution is positive for the case in point, they can only lead to an effective increase in efficiency.

Whereas low- T_c superconductors are well-described by a $U(1)$ theory, high- T_c superconductors are relatively poorly understood. Arguably, the effective order parameter of the high- T_c superconductor is also a complex field ϕ . This is seen in an idealised $SO(5)$ model of high- T_c

*E-mail: r.rivers@imperial.ac.uk

†Email: amarendra.swarup@imperial.ac.uk

superconductors with a five-component 'rotor' order parameter field [15], three of whose components are the Néel vector of antiferromagnetism and the remaining two the complex field coupling to electromagnetism. The $SO(5)$ symmetry is explicitly broken, restored only at critical doping. Classically, the order parameter 'rotor' has fixed length, forcing vortices to have antiferromagnetic cores [16], i.e. we have a generalised $X - Y$ model (or, in the parlance of QFT, a non-linear σ -model). However, fluctuations soften the constraint and, unless the system is very close to critical doping [17], normal Abrikosov vortices with winding number $n = \pm 1$ are produced from the breaking of the electromagnetic $U(1)$ for a type-II system. The symmetry-breaking groundstates of the theory in this case are the S^1 of the residual 'Mexican hat' potential.

Eq.2 is tested in [7] for $\sigma = 1/4$. With $\sigma/2 \approx 1/8$ so small, there is no way that scaling can be accurately confirmed. However, the flux that is observed is commensurate with (2), provided $\tilde{f} \approx 1/16$, a low efficiency. It was noted in Ref.[7] that, if the superconductor were to behave as an X-Y model, for which $\sigma \approx 0.15$, rather than 0.25, we would expect an order of magnitude more vortices and antivortices. Since we are hardly seeing enough for the $U(1)$ GL case, we do not consider this possibility further. If, on the other hand, there was no correlation between vortices and antivortices, $(\Delta N)^2$ would be proportional to area $A \propto C^2$, to give $\Delta N \propto C/\xi_{def} \propto (t_Q/t_0)^{-\sigma}$, in contrast to (2). Equivalently, with the total number of vortices and antivortices $N \propto A/\xi_{def}^2 \propto (C/\xi_{def})^2$ this would imply $\Delta N \propto N^{1/2}$. This was originally proposed in [6], but the new data is totally incompatible with such a possibility.

To show how (2) is justified and that a low efficiency is reasonable, we need microscopic field dynamics which, inevitably, not only encode causality but also discriminate between systems in a way that causal bounds cannot. Our understanding of vortex formation is that, once the transition temperature has been crossed, field ordering is implemented by the growth in the amplitudes of the unstable long wavelength modes. The vortices embody the frustration of the order parameter field as it adopts different groundstate values in adjacent domains.

In this regard, we assume that field fluctuations can be taken to be Gaussian until the time $\bar{t}$, say, when the back-reaction can be considered to stop field growth. For strongly damped systems like those considered here it can be taken to be effectively instantaneous. Specifically, if the symmetry breaking scale is $|\phi| = \eta$, the transition is implemented by the time $\bar{t}$ for which $\langle |\phi|^2 \rangle_{\bar{t}} \approx \eta^2$. Because of this we have the consequences of Gaussian fluctuations imprinted on a subsequently highly non-linear system.

We identify vortices by the (line) zeroes of the field at this time. Writing the complex order-parameter field ϕ as $\phi = (\phi_1 + i\phi_2)/\sqrt{2}$, the *total density* of zeroes in the

(12) plane (intersections of vortices plus antivortices) is

$$\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{x}) = \delta^2[\phi(\mathbf{x})] |\epsilon_{jk} \partial_j \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) \partial_k \phi_2(\mathbf{x})|. \quad (3)$$

where $\delta^2[\phi(\mathbf{x})] = \delta[\phi_1(\mathbf{x})]\delta[\phi_2(\mathbf{x})]$ and ϵ_{jk} is the anti-symmetric tensor. For independently Gaussian ϕ_i , the ensemble average total density, to be matched to (1), is [18, 19]

$$d(t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{G''(0, t)}{G(0, t)} \right). \quad (4)$$

In (4) $G(r, t) = \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}) \phi^*(\mathbf{0}) \rangle_t$ is the field correlation function at time t at separation $r = |\mathbf{x}|$ and the derivatives are with respect to r . It should also be noted that $d(\bar{t}) = (\xi_{def})^{-2}$ from (1).

As we are considering planar systems, for simplicity we shall only look at the properties of field zeroes in the (12) plane produced by a quench. What is relevant here, for high- T_c experiments, is not the *total* density (3), but rather the *topological* density of field zeroes of $\phi(\mathbf{x})$, which determines net magnetic flux. This is

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) = \delta^2[\phi(\mathbf{x})] \epsilon_{jk} \partial_j \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) \partial_k \phi_2(\mathbf{x}). \quad (5)$$

in which the modulus has been dropped.

Consider a superconductor film of area A and circumference C , enclosing n_+ vortices and n_- antivortices. The topological charge $\Delta n = n_+ - n_-$ will be zero on average, $\langle \rho \rangle = 0$. However, there will be a nonzero variance

$$(\Delta N)^2 = \int_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in A} d^2x d^2y \langle \rho(\mathbf{x}) \rho(\mathbf{y}) \rangle_{\bar{t}} \quad (6)$$

at time $t = \bar{t}$ when vortices form.

Given the density ρ of (5) and the results of [18, 19], it has been shown by one of us (RR) [20] that, if $g(r, t) = G(r, t)/G(0, t)$, then

$$(\Delta N)^2 = \frac{2C}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dr \frac{g'^2(r, t)}{1 - g^2(r, t)}. \quad (7)$$

This equation is the pivotal equation of this paper. The linear dependence on C is purely a result of the formative Gaussian fluctuations. Although it could be argued that the 'geodesic rule' is reasonable, when vortices have classical profiles, it is not obviously the case at the early times that are relevant here, when vortices are appearing from a tangle of line zeroes. Nonetheless, we have recovered the consequences of this rule without needing to mention geodesics.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the use of (4) to count vortices is equally unreasonable, since the creation of classical vortices requires the non-Gaussian interaction between ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 . There is an answer to this for global $U(1)$ theory, and our neglect of magnetic field fluctuations suggests that this may provide a partial answer here. Essentially, at time $\bar{t}$ when most of the field energy is in field gradients, the energy $\mathcal{E}$ associated with

the gradient energy of the *Gaussian* field ϕ in a surface of area A takes the form

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2x \langle |\nabla\phi|^2 \rangle_{\bar{t}} \approx 2\pi\eta^2 \int d^2x \langle \bar{\rho}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\bar{t}} \quad (8)$$

on using the result (4). That is, $\mathcal{E} \approx 2\pi\eta^2 N$, where $N = \langle n \rangle$ is the ensemble average of $n = n_+ + n_-$, the total number of vortices and antivortices respectively. A vortex is a tube of false vacuum whose energy/length is $\epsilon \sim 2\pi\eta^2$, showing that, qualitatively, the energy matches that of a set of classical defects whose number is the number of field zeroes (of Gaussian fields) at the time at which defects are formed. It follows from the Gaussian approximation that, to a first approximation, dimensionality is not important if we ignore the frozen fluctuations of the magnetic field, as we shall. For these, dimensionality is important, and is a determinant in demonstrating their smallness [14].

There are further qualifications. For example, zeroes occur on all scales, and $G(0, \bar{t})$ is infinite without a cutoff. Provisionally, we introduce coarsegraining by hand, modifying $G(r, t)$ by damping short wavelengths $l = O(\xi_0)$ in $D = 2$ spatial dimensions as

$$G(r, t) = \int d^2k e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} P(k, t) e^{-k^2 l^2}. \quad (9)$$

In terms of the moments of $P(k, t) e^{-k^2 l^2}$,

$$G_n(t) = \int_0^\infty dk k^{2n-1} P(k, t) e^{-k^2 l^2}, \quad (10)$$

the density d of (4) is the second moment $d = G_2/2\pi G_1$. The cutoff is irrelevant once the 'Bragg peak' at wavenumber $k_0 \approx \xi_{def}^{-1}$ in the power has passed to long wavelength modes. This has been discussed in detail elsewhere [20, 21] by one of us (RR).

We note that $(\Delta N)^2$ requires more than the lowest moments of $P(k, t)$ needed for the total density d . A tedious calculation [22] shows that, approximately

$$\frac{(\Delta N)^2}{C} \propto \frac{3G_3}{20G_2} - \frac{G_2}{12G_1}. \quad (11)$$

Nonetheless, as long as $kP(k, \bar{t})$ is strongly peaked at $k_0 \sim \xi_{def}^{-1}$ then, with only one length scale, we recover (2). Eqs. (4) and (11) show that the efficiency factors f and $\tilde{f}$ of (1) and (2) respectively are not related directly. A low efficiency in producing total flux density does not require a low efficiency in producing net flux.

In order to get an idea of the size of the efficiency $\tilde{f}$ for producing net flux we need a model for $g(r, \bar{t})$. The vanishing of $\langle \phi \partial_i \phi^* \rangle$ requires that $g'(0, t) = 0$. Empirically, we choose

$$g(r, \bar{t}) \approx \exp(-r^2/2\bar{\xi}^2) \quad (12)$$

for r sufficiently small to dominate the integral, for some $\bar{\xi} = O(\xi_Z)$ to be determined. At times $\bar{t} \gg t_0$ such

a Gaussian form is appropriate for the diffusion of field ordering (independent of dimension D) that we would expect from a dissipative system. Inserting this in (7) gives

$$(\Delta N)^2 \approx \frac{C}{4\pi^2\bar{\xi}} \Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \approx 0.059 \frac{C}{\bar{\xi}}. \quad (13)$$

If $\bar{\xi} = \xi_Z$ we find $\tilde{f} \approx 1/4$, the value obtained [23] by a naive discretisation of the phase angle into multiples of $\pi/2$ and the 'geodesic rule'.

For diffusive behaviour we expect $\bar{\xi}^2 \propto \bar{t}$, independent of dimension. In turn, we expect $\bar{t} = O(t_Z)$, where t_Z is the Zurek causal time, the first time at which the causal horizon is large enough to accommodate defects. Putting this together, in units of ξ_0 and t_0 , we would expect

$$\bar{\xi}^2 \sim \xi_0^2 t_Z/t_0 \quad (14)$$

with a coefficient of proportionality $O(1)$.

In mean-field $t_Z \approx \sqrt{t_Q t_0}$ [2]. Inserting this in (14) and then, in turn, into (13), recreates (2) with $\sigma = 1/4$, justifying the random walk assumption of ZK in units of ξ_Z . This is our first general result. As we noted earlier, Eq.2 is tested in [7] for $\sigma = 1/4$.

To fix the efficiency coefficient $\tilde{f}$ in (2) requires the coefficient of proportionality in (14). Explicitly, we take $\bar{t} = bt_Z$, where $b > 1$ is order unity. With instabilities leading to exponential growth in field amplitudes, we expect b to depend only logarithmically on t_Q and the detailed properties of the system. We note that b only occurs in $\tilde{f}$ to the power $b^{-1/4}$, and the already weak logarithmic dependence on the quench rate and the system is totally diluted. That is, the efficiency is almost independent of the system.

As a demonstration we not only assume the GL theory for equilibrium superconductors but assume the time-dependent Landau-Ginzburg (TDLG) equation for the transition. That is, we take

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial t} = -\frac{\delta F}{\delta \phi_a} + \eta_a, \quad (15)$$

for the GL quadratic energy F , where η_a is Gaussian thermal noise, whose strength is irrelevant in defining $f(r, t)$ in the linear regime. This is a reliable guide to the non-linear theory of low- T_c superconductors[13]. Neglecting thermal fluctuations, we find [21, 24] that, in the linear regime,

$$g(r, t) \approx \exp(-r^2 t_0 / 8\xi_0^2), \quad (16)$$

for small r , provided t is sufficiently large. As a result, $g(r, \bar{t}) \approx \exp(-r^2 / 8b\xi_Z^2)$ at time $\bar{t}$, whereby the efficiency factor $\tilde{f}$ of (2) takes the value $\tilde{f} \approx b^{-1/4}/6$. For the linear equation (15) b can be estimated from the parameters of the model [21]. Values of b between 2 and 3 are plausible, which gives an efficiency roughly half the canonical value of $\tilde{f} = 1/4$, but still larger than that seen in [7]. What

we are saying is that, although we would not defend (15) as describing the dynamics of high- T_c , lower efficiencies than the standard guesses based on static descriptions are natural. This completes our discussion of high- T_c systems.

In the remainder of this letter, we shall take a parallel look at experiments that observe vortices at the $U(1)$ symmetry-breaking interface of liquid crystals at an isotropic-nematic (IN) transition [9, 10]. For uniaxial nematic liquid crystals the bulk order parameter in the nematic phase is the director vector, with order parameter space $RP^2 = S^2/Z_2$. This allows for string defects with $n = \pm 1/2$ windings. The transition is first order. However, the anchoring of the director at the two-dimensional IN interface forces it to lie on a cone, whereby the order parameter space is a circle S^1 , and defects have winding number $n = \pm 1$, corresponding to $U(1)$ breaking. It is suggested in [9, 10] that the transition could evolve by the same growth of unstable modes that we have invoked for superconductors. At least, the whole formation takes place almost instantaneously and the structure is completely well focussed, implying that the transition is not first order. We assume that the order parameter field is softened by fluctuations so that defects can be identified with its zeroes. Even if there is a crossover, rather than a true transition, our previous analysis goes through unchanged provided it is not too broad [25], which we assume.

In Ref.[9] the authors cool a droplet of liquid crystal through its critical temperature and measure N and ΔN through square regions at the surface, where the behaviour is as above. They do not attempt to confirm (1) directly, but compare the ensemble averages ΔN to N . A fit to the form

$$\Delta N = c(N)^\nu \quad (17)$$

gives $\nu = 0.26 \pm 0.11$, and a value for c of

$$c = 0.76 \pm 0.21. \quad (18)$$

We observe that, with the same choice of correlation function (12), the total number N of vortices and antivortices passing through a surface, area A is, from (4),

$$N = A/2\pi\bar{\xi}^2, \quad (19)$$

irrespective of shape (the factor of 2π in the denominator is a direct reflection of the same factor in (4), and does not assume a circular surface). For a *square* surface (with $A = (C/4)^2$) this enables us to use (13) to eliminate $\bar{\xi}$, giving

$$\Delta N \approx 0.77(N)^{1/4}, \quad (20)$$

independently of σ .

This value is in remarkable agreement with c of (18), and is our second result. It is to be contrasted with the values of $c = 0.57$ and $c = 0.71$ that are obtained under the simplistic assumption of random phase distribution in uniform arrays of triangular or square domains, respectively [9].

The value $\nu = 1/4$ of (20), already anticipated in (2), can take no other value insofar as field ordering is driven by early Gaussian fluctuations before non-linearity becomes important.

We thank Emil Polturak, Ariel Maniv and Rajarshi Ray for helpful discussions. This work is, in part, supported by the COSLAB programme of the European Science Foundation.

-
- [1] W.H. Zurek, *Nature* **317**, 505 (1985), *Acta Physica Polonica* **B24**, 1301 (1993).
 - [2] W.H. Zurek, *Physics Reports* **276**, 177 (1996).
 - [3] T.W.B. Kibble, in *Common Trends in Particle and Condensed Matter Physics*, *Physics Reports* **67**, 183 (1980).
 - [4] R. Monaco, J. Mygind and R.J. Rivers, eprint cond-mat/0112321, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 080603 (2002).
R. Monaco, J. Mygind and R.J. Rivers, eprint cond-mat/0207504, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 104506 (2003).
 - [5] S. Ducci, P.L. Ramazza, W. González-Viñas, and F.T. Arecchi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5210 (1999).
 - [6] R. Carmi and E. Polturak, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 7595 (1999).
 - [7] A. Maniv, E. Polturak and G. Koren, eprint cond-mat/0304359.
 - [8] T.W.B. Kibble, *J. Phys. A* **9**, 1387 (1976).
 - [9] S. Dugal, R. Ray and A.M. Srivastava *Phys. Rev. Lett* **83**, 5030 (1999)
 - [10] R. Ray and A.M. Srivastava, eprint hep-ph/0110165.
 - [11] M. Hindmarsh and A. Rajantie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4660 (2000); A. Rajantie, *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **124**, 5 (2001).
 - [12] N.D. Antunes, L.M.A. Bettencourt, W.H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2824 (1999).
 - [13] D. Ibaceta and E. Calzetta, *Phys. Rev.* **E60**, 2999 (1999).
 - [14] T.W.B. Kibble and A. Rajantie, eprint cond-mat/0306633.
 - [15] S-C. Zhang, eprint cond-mat/9610140, *Science* **275**, 1089 (1997)
 - [16] D.P. Arovas, A.J. Berlinsky, C. Kallin and S-C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2871 (1997).
 - [17] S. Alama, A.J. Berlinsky, L. Brossard and T. Giorgi, eprint cond-mat/9812283, *Phys. Rev.* **B60**, 6901 (1999).
 - [18] B.I. Halperin, published in *Physics of Defects*, proceedings of Les Houches, Session XXXV 1980 NATO ASI, editors Balian, Kléman and Poirier (North-Holland Press, 1981) p.816.
 - [19] F. Liu and G.F. Mazenko, *Phys. Rev.* **B46**, 5963 (1992).
 - [20] E. Kavoussanaki, R.J. Rivers and G. Karra, *Condensed Matter Physics* **3**, 133 (2000).
 - [21] R.J. Rivers, eprint cond-mat/0105171, *Journal of Low*

- Temperature Physics* **124**, 41-84, (2001).
- [22] R.J. Rivers and E. Kavoussanaki, eprint cond-mat/9901348.
- [23] S. Rudaz, A.M. Srivastava and S. Varma, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A***14**, 1591 (1999).
- [24] R.J. Rivers, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **84**, 1248 (2000).
- [25] N. Antunes, L.M. Bettencourt, W. H. Zurek (Les Houches article, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **82**, 2824 (1999).